

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

F-907-P

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/018549

International filing date (day/month/year)

07.12.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

09.12.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

CHUO HATSUJO KABUSHIKI KAISHA

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/018549

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/018549

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-13	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-13	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-13	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP 11-188309 A (Chuo Hatsujo Kabushiki Kaisha), 13 July 1999, Par. No. 0005, Fig. 1</p> <p>Document 2: US 5981086 A (Morton International Inc.), 09 November 1999, full text</p> <p>Document 3: JP 52-9040 A (Kansai Paint Co., Ltd.), 24 January 1977, page 3, lower left column, line 8 to page 4, upper left column</p> <p>Document 4: JP 2003-211083 A (Dai Nippon Toryo Co., Ltd.), 29 July 2003, Par. Nos. 0018-0025, 0067-0068, 0086-0090</p> <p>The inventions of claims 1-2 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR. Applying the zinc content in the epoxy resin coating disclosed in document 2 to the epoxy resin coating disclosed in document 1 would be easy for a party skilled in the art. In addition, because epoxy polyester resins are commonly known as epoxy resin coatings, making the topcoat layer an epoxy polyester resin in particular is merely the selection of the optimum material from publicly known materials.</p> <p>The inventions of claims 3-4 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR. The thickness of the undercoat layer and topcoat layer is a matter of design variation to be appropriately determined by a party skilled in the art.</p> <p>The inventions of claims 5-6, 8-9 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1, 2 and 3 cited in the ISR. Applying the coating method disclosed in document 3 to the two-layered coating method disclosed in document 1 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.</p> <p>The invention of claim 7 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1-3. In general, pre-heating the material to be coated before the undercoating process is commonly known (for example, refer to document 4 etc.).</p>			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/018549

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: Box V

The inventions of claims 10-11 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1-3. In general, incorporating a blocked isocyanate in an epoxy resin coating is commonly known (for example, refer to document 4 etc.). In addition, the content of blocked isocyanate is a matter of design variation to be appropriately determined by a party skilled in the art.

The invention of claim 12 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1-3. In general, the resin disclosed in claim 12 is commonly known as an epoxy resin (for example, refer to document 4 etc.).

The invention of claim 13 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1-3. In general, incorporating an extender pigment in an epoxy polyester resin coating is commonly known (for example, refer to document 4 etc.).